

**Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA)**  
**U.S. Department of Interior**  
**Bureau of Land Management**

---

**OFFICE:** *Hassayampa Field Office (HFO)*

**NEPA/TRACKING NUMBER:** *DOI-BLM-AZ-P010-2013-0010-DNA*

**CASEFILE/PROJECT NUMBER:** *AZA-32608*

**PROPOSED ACTION TITLE/TYPE:** Authorization of a Special Recreation Permit for Southwest Hunting Adventures to operate a hunting guide service / DNA

**LOCATION/LEGAL DESCRIPTION:** AZGFD Hunting Units 41, 42, 44A, 20B, and 20C

**APPLICANT (if any):** *Troy Scott / Eric Hunt, dba Southwest Hunting Adventures*

**A. Description of the Proposed Action and any applicable mitigation measures**

Approve a multi-year Special Recreation Permit authorizing Troy Scott, dba Southwest Hunting Adventures, to conduct commercial guided deer, sheep, antelope, and mountain lions in the above-mentioned GMUs. The permit would be effective until December 1, 2022, subject to annual renewals provided the applicant remains in good standing. Group size would average four to six people per trip, including guides, with a maximum of ten people per trip. Overnight base camps and the use of horses and pack stock would be authorized under this permit. Camps would consist of a travel trailer and up to four tents for sleeping. Most cooking would be done with a propane stove and campfires would be built only where authorized. When horses or pack stock are used, the applicant would obtain permission to use existing corrals from grazing permittees whenever possible, otherwise portable corral panels would be used in existing disturbed areas. Length of stay at base camps may occasionally exceed 14 days when necessary to fill clients' tag, but would not exceed the length of the hunting season. All tags and hunting seasons are administered by the Arizona Game and Fish Department. All trash and game parts would be hauled out and properly disposed of. Cat holes or portable chemical toilets would be used for human waste. Cell phones would be used in case of emergency. The attached "Phoenix District BLM Supplemental Stipulations for Special Recreation Permits" are hereby incorporated into this proposed action

**B. Land Use Plan Conformance**

Land Use Plan (LUP) Name: Bradshaw-Harquahala Record of Decision and Approved Resource Management Plan

Date Approved/Amended: **4/22/2010**

☒ The proposed action is in conformance with the applicable LUP because it is specifically provided for in the following LUP decision(s):  
AC-15: Preserve outstanding opportunities for high quality hiking, backpacking, hunting, wildlife observation, and study and observation of cultural resource sites.

☐ The proposed action is in conformance with the LUP, even though it is not specifically provided for, because it is clearly consistent with the following LUP decision(s) (objectives, terms, and conditions):

**C. Identify applicable National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documents and other related documents that cover the proposed action.**

*Special Recreation Permits for Commercial Recreation Activities on Public Lands in Arizona”, Environmental Assessment, AZ931-93-001, dated 8/93*

**D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria**

- 1. Is the proposed action a feature of, or essentially similar to, an alternative analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)? Is the project within the same analysis area, or if the project location is different, are the geographic and resource conditions sufficiently similar to those analyzed in the exiting NEPA document(s)? If there are differences, can you explain why they are not substantial?**

Yes, the current proposed action is substantially the same type of action as that analyzed in the above programmatic EA. Page 2 of the EA, under the Proposed Action, describes the issuance of multi-year permits for these types of activities, and identifies a list of Terms and Conditions that would be imposed on permittees. The current proposed action includes such a list of terms and conditions, which were substantially compiled from the EA.

- 2. Is the range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s) appropriate with respect to the new proposed action, given current environmental concerns, interests, and resource values?**

Two alternatives, proposed action and no action, were analyzed in the existing programmatic EA and they are still appropriate with current concerns and issues. The no action alternative would be to not issue the permit. The proposed action of issuing the permit would result in no significant impact. No new concerns or proposals have been presented by the public to require a new alternative.

- 3. Is the existing analysis valid in light of new information or circumstances (such as, rangeland health standard assessment, recent endangered species listings, and updated lists of BLM-sensitive species)? Can you reasonably conclude that**

**new information and new circumstances would not substantially change the analysis of the new proposed action?**

The analysis undertaken in the programmatic EA is still valid. Since the development of this EA three changes have been made to the listing of “Critical Elements of the Human Environment” which must be addressed in each NEPA analysis. Two new elements were added: (1) Invasive, Non-Native Species and (2) Environmental Justice. The proposed action above would have no impacts on either of these elements. The third change made to the “Critical Elements” related to Water Quality and clarified that impacts to Water Quality of both groundwater and surface water must be considered in all NEPA documents. This change would not affect the analysis of impacts to water resources undertaken in the original programmatic EA.

Standards for Rangeland Health were incorporated into the LUP listed above; therefore, the proposed action was reviewed to determine whether it is in conformance with the approved standards. The proposed action will not adversely affect the watershed functional condition, the desired plant community or the riparian functional condition for the affected area

**4. Are the direct, indirect, and cumulative effects that would result from implementation of the new proposed action similar (both quantitatively and qualitatively) to those analyzed in the existing NEPA document?**

Yes, direct and indirect impacts of the proposed action are unchanged from those identified in the programmatic EA. The existing NEPA document does analyze site-specific impacts related to the current proposed action, with the understanding that the “site” in this case involves a large expanse of public domain.

**5. Are the public involvement and interagency review associated with existing NEPA documents(s) adequate for the current proposed action?**

The interagency consultation and public involvement and review associated with the existing programmatic EA is adequate for the current proposed action

**E. Persons/Agencies/BLM Staff Consulted**

<b><u>Name</u></b>	<b><u>Title</u></b>	<b><u>Resource/Agency Represented</u></b>
Tom Bickauskas	Travel Management Coordinator	Travel Management/BLM
Dave Eddy	Geologist	Minerals and Mining/BLM
Cody Carter	Wildlife Biologist	Wildlife and T&E Species/BLM
Bryan Lausten	Archeologist	Cultural Sites/BLM

Note: Refer to the EA/EIS for a complete list of the team members participating in the preparation of the original environmental analysis or planning documents

**CONCLUSION:**

Based on the review documented above, I conclude that this proposal conforms to the applicable land use plan and that the NEPA documentation fully covers the proposed action and constitute BLM's compliance with the requirements of NEPA.

\_\_\_\_\_/S/\_\_\_\_\_  
Project Lead: Victor Vizcaino

\_\_\_\_\_/S/\_\_\_\_\_  
P&EC: James Ingram

\_\_\_\_\_/S/\_\_\_\_\_      12/28/12 \_\_\_\_\_  
Field Manager: D. Remington Hawes      **Date**

Note: The signed Conclusion on this Worksheet is part of an interim step in the BLM's internal decision process and does not constitute an appealable decision. However, the lease, permit, or other authorization based on this DNA is subject to protest or appeal under 43 CFR Part 4 and the program-specific regulations.